

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

LINNE ROSE, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BEHR PROCESS CORP., BEHR PAINT
CORP., MASCO CORP., THE HOME
DEPOT, INC., and HOME DEPOT U.S.A.,
INC.,,

Defendants.

NO. 2:17-cv-01754-MJP

**STIPULATED MOTION AND
ORDER TO STAY CASE**

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR

May 29, 2018

I. STIPULATION

Subject to approval of this Court, Plaintiff Linne Rose and Defendants Behr Paint Corp., Behr Process Corporation, Masco Corporation (collectively, “Behr”), The Home Depot, Inc. and Home Depot U.S.A., Inc. (collectively, “Home Depot”), by and through their attorneys, hereby stipulate and request an order staying this case, including all deadlines for discovery and other matters, pending a decision on the motion for preliminary and final approval of a class action settlement involving three related actions before other district courts (*Anderson v. Behr Process Corp.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-08735 (N.D. Ill.); *Bishop v. Behr Process Corp.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-04464 (N.D. Ill.); and *In re Behr*, Case No. 8:17-cv-01016 (C.D. Cal.)) (“Settled Cases”).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

II. BACKGROUND

On May 1, 2018, plaintiffs in *Bishop* filed an amended complaint that incorporated the named plaintiffs in *In re Behr* and *Anderson*. See Am. Compl. (*Bishop* Dkt. #60) at ¶¶ 7-39. Shortly thereafter, on May 3, 2018, plaintiffs in *Bishop* filed a motion for preliminary approval of a class action settlement. See Mot. for Preliminary Approval (*Bishop* Dkt. #61) at *passim*.

If the settlement agreement in *Bishop* is granted preliminary approval, it would resolve all claims against all Defendants in this action. See Behr Mem. in Opp. to Mot. for Transfer and Consolidation, *In re: Behr DeckOver Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2821 (Dkt. #30) at 1-2; Order Denying Transfer (MDL Dkt. #53) at 1.

Defendants expect that the court in *Bishop* will consider the motion for preliminary approval on June 27, 2018. See Order (*Bishop* Dkt. #78).

III. AUTHORITY

The Court “may, with propriety, find it is efficient for its own docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case.” *Levy v. Certified Grocers of California*, 593 F.2d 857, 863 (9th Cir. 1979). In considering whether a stay is appropriate, a district court should consider (1) the possible damage that may result from granting a stay, (2) the hardship or inequity a party may suffer in being required to go forward, and (3) the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions of law expected to result from a stay. See *id.* at 864; *CMAX, Inc. v. Hall*, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th Cir. 1962).

Courts in the Ninth Circuit and across the country routinely stay actions pending the review and approval of class settlements in other district courts that would resolve all claims

1 brought in those actions. *See Annunziato v. eMachines Inc.*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97020,
2 *15-16 (C.D. Cal. 2006); *see also Albert v. Blue Diamond Growers*, 232 F. Supp. 3d 509
3 (S.D.N.Y. 2017); *Ali v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26670, *7-9
4 (W.D.Okla. 2014); *Lindley v. Life Investors Ins._Co. of America*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94623,
5 *11 (N.D.Okla. 2009); *In re RC2 Corp. Toy Lead Paint Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No.
6 1893, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14121, *13-14 (N.D.Ill. 2008). If this case is stayed pending
7 consideration of the *Bishop* Settlement, no Party will suffer any hardship. Plaintiff and all
8 members of the proposed class in this case have the right to participate in the settlement or opt
9 out of it to pursue his or her own litigation. And, any stay would be limited for any Plaintiff or
10 any member of the proposed class who opts out of the *Bishop* Settlement. *See Amchem Prods.*
11 *v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 597 (1997).
12

13
14 In contrast, if this litigation continues, all Parties would face the prospect of incurring
15 substantial and unnecessary litigation costs. *See Annunziato*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97020,
16 *15-16 (“[I]f the Ohio state court approves the preliminary settlement, [litigants] would be
17 saved from hundreds of hours spent on discovery and briefing in proceeding with this case....
18 this Court finds efficiency is best achieved by granting a ... stay.”). The Parties also
19 acknowledge that the settlement will help resolve this litigation. Thus, the Parties agree that a
20 stay of this action is appropriate, pending a decision on the motion for preliminary approval in
21 *Bishop*, and, a decision on any forthcoming motion for final approval.
22

23 The Parties agree to keep this Court informed regarding the status of the settlement of
24 the *Bishop* case by having Behr file a Status Report by July 13, 2018, and every 60 days
25 thereafter, reporting on the progress of preliminary approval, notice, and final approval of the
26 settlement.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the above, the Parties hereby stipulate, agree and move, subject to the Court's approval, that:

1. This case should be stayed pending a decision on the motion for preliminary approval in *Bishop, et al., v. Behr Process Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 1:17- cv- 04464 (N.D. Ill.), and, if preliminary approval is granted, through a decision on any forthcoming motion for final approval;
2. Behr shall file a Status Report by July 13, 2018, and every 60 days thereafter, reporting on the progress of preliminary approval, notice, and final approval.

Stipulated and presented this 29th day of May, 2018.

TERRELL MARSHALL LAW GROUP MILLS MEYERS SWARTLING P.S.
PLLC

By: /s/ Beth E. Terrell

Beth E. Terrell, WSBA No. 26759
Eric Riley Nusser, WSBA No. 51513
WHITFIELD BRYSON & MASON, LLP
Daniel K. Bryson *Pro Hac Vice*
Patrick M. Wallace *Pro Hac Vice*
Scott C. Harris *Pro Hac Vice*

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed
Class

By s/ Caryn Geraghty Jorgensen

Caryn Geraghty Jorgensen WSBA No. 27514
Email: cjorgensen@millsmeyers.com
John Fetter WSBA No. 40800
Email: jfetter@millsmeyers.com
Mills Meyers Swartling
1000 2nd Avenue, 30 FL
Seattle, WA 98104
Phone: (206) 382-1000
Fax: (206) 386-7343
Attorneys for Defendants Home Depot, Inc. and
Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.

1 WHITFIELD BYSON & MASON, LLP

2 By s/ Daniel K. Bryson

3 Daniel K. Bryson, *Pro Hac Vice*
4 E-mail: dan@wbmlp.com
5 Patrick M. Wallace, *Pro Hac Vice*
6 Scott C. Harris, *Pro Hac Vice*
7 900 W. Morgan Street
8 Raleigh, NC 27603
9 Main Telephone: 919-600-5000
10 Direct Telephone: 919-600-5002
11 Fax: 919-600-5035
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed
13 Class

MORRIS MANNING & MARTIN

By s/ Jeffrey Douglass

Jeffrey Douglass, *Pro Hac Vice*
Robert Alpert, *Pro Hac Vice*
1600 Atlanta Financial Center
3343 Peachtree Road, NE
Atlanta, GA 30326, USA Phone: 404.233.7000
800-849-0970
Fax: 404.365.9532
Attorneys for Defendants Home Depot, Inc.
and Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.

CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN, P.S.

By s/ Emilia L. Sweeney

Emilia L. Sweeney, WSBA No. 23371
Email: sweeney@carneylaw.com
Jason M. Kettrick, WSBA No. 35459
Email: kettrick@carneylaw.com
Elliot C. Copenhaver, WSBA No. 46909
Email: copenhaver@carneylaw.com
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3600
Seattle, WA 98104-7010
Telephone: (206) 622-8020
Facsimile:(206)467-8215
Attorneys for Defendants Behr Processing
Corporation, Behr Paint Corp and Masco
Corporation

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By s/ Kathleen P. Lally

Kathleen P. Lally
One of the Attorneys for Defendant
Behr Process Corporation
Mark S. Mester
ark.mester@lw.com
Kathleen P. Lally
kathleen.lally@lw.com
330 North Wabash Avenue, Suite 2800
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Telephone: (312) 876-7700

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

V. ORDER

It is so ordered.

Dated this 30th day of May, 2018.



The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman
United States Senior District Court Judge

1
2
3 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

4 I hereby certify that on this 29th day of May, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing
5 with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which caused all CM/ECF participants
6 to be served by electronic means.

7 DATED this 29th day of May, 2018.

8 CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN, P.S.

9
10 By: s/ Andrea Williams

11 Andrea Williams, Legal Assistant
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26